

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/790,964	03/02/2004	Franklin T. Nakasone	67167-002; 5863-03	2137	
26096 7	590 02/08/2005		EXAMINER		
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. 400 WEST MAPLE ROAD			BARRETT, SUZANNE LALE DINO		
SUITE 350			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			3676		

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/	/						
		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/790,9	64	NAKASONE, FRANKLIN	N T.		
<i>'</i> )	Office Action Summary	Examine		Art Unit			
		L .	Dino Barrett	3676			
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence address	**		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Faile Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IN MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no ev tion. s, a reply within the stat period will apply and w y statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be utory minimum of thirty (30) d ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro lication to become ABANDO	timely filed  ays will be considered timely.  m the mailing date of this communic  NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.		
Status	·						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	n 17 January 200	<b>5</b> .				
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for a	- allowance except	for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the meri	ts is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 21,22 and 24 is/are allowed.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-8,11-14,17,18,20,23 and 25-27 is/are rejected.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 9,10,15,16,19 is/are objected to.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Applicat	ion Papers						
· · · · · ·	The specification is objected to by the Ex						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[	-	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	= : :	•	, ,	047.10		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by			•	• •		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			•			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Experience.	uments have bee uments have bee e priority docume Bureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applica ents have been recei e 17.2(a)).	ation Noved in this National Stage	<b>;</b>		
~ (	See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certi	ned copies not receiv	ved.			
	;						
Attachmen	• •						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	48)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail				
3) 🔲 Infori	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO// r No(s)/Mail Date			Patent Application (PTO-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-20,23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 6-7, the phrase "said retainer engagement feature extending from the housing" lacks antecedent basis since the previous recitation in line 2 sets forth only "a retainer engagement feature". Furthermore, in claims 1,11,17, the recitation that the retainer engages the groove at an angle not perpendicular is not correct and not clearly understood with respect to the specification. Since the groove begins at 42 in Fig.2, after the retainer engagement feature, the retainer legs do not flex when engaged in the groove, rather the bridge portion flexes at an angle not perpendicular. Furthermore, in claim 9,15,18,19, the recitation of "a retainer engagement feature" is redundant as this element has already been recited in claims 1,11 and 17.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2,4-7,11-13,17,18,20,23,25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin 5,038,589 in view of Mall 2,021,241.

Martin teaches a lock cylinder 14 and core 12 retainer clip 40 having first and second legs 42 and a bridge portion 44, wherein the cylinder has retainer grooves 38 and the core has retainer grooves 24 to receive the retainer legs. The cylinder further provides a retainer engagement feature 46 to secure the retainer clip within the grooves. The front loading core 12 further has a flange portion 16 to engage a recessed portion (not labeled) at the front of the cylinder housing bore 28. Note that the method limitations of claims 17 and 20 are considered inherent to the use of the device as disclosed by Martin. Mall teaches a coupling means between a housing 28 and core member 18 comprising a retainer clip 36 having two legs 32,34 with beveled end portions 46,48 and a bridge portion 56 and wherein the housing 28 has grooves 38,40 to receive the legs 32,34 and a retainer engagement feature formed as angled abutments 50 which the retainer legs flex over upon initial insertion and which ultimately fit into recesses 52 in the retainer legs. The core 18 further has grooves 62 to receive abutment means 60 on the legs 32,34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the clip and housing of Martin by providing engaging abutment means therebetween as taught by Mall to ensure a secure assembly between the housing and core members.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin '589 in view of Mall '241 and further in view of Dauenbaugh 4,099,397.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,964 Page 4

Art Unit: 3676

Dauenbaugh teaches a similar lock cylinder assembly with a retaining clip 12 and further having a groove 58 in the cylinder 10 to engage with an extension 26 on the plug 22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the cylinder and plug of Martin to have an extension and groove as taught by Dauenbaugh to enhance the engagement between the cylinder and plug as desired.

5. Claims 8,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin '589 in view of Mall '241 and further in view of either Dauenbaugh '397 or Myers 5,636,540.

Both Dauenbaugh and Myers teach a lock cylinder retainer clip (12; 10 respectively) having a bridge portion (70; 50) with an aperture therein. In the case of Dauenbaugh, the aperture receives a fastener to secure the retainer to the panel 20 (Fig.2). Since Martin teaches that the clip 40 can have a different configuration (col.4, lines 23-24), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the clip of Martin by providing an aperture in the bridge as taught by either Dauenbaugh or Myers to facilitate usage of the clip.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 9,10,15,16,19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Claims 21,22,24 are allowed.

The prior art of record fails to teach a housing engagement feature which secures the retainer clip by engaging an angled detent with an aperture on the clip bridge as claimed. While the clip of Dauenbaugh is taught to have an aperture in the bridge 50 to receive a fastener as shown in Fig. 2, it is fastened to the panel, not the housing. Furthermore, while Martin teaches a housing securement member 46 for the clip 40, this member 46 does not engage an aperture in the bridge of the clip and the prior art of record does not provide motivation or suggestion to provide the clip of Martin with an aperture to be engaged by a housing member. Additionally, while the clip of Mall teaches an angled detent 50 of the housing engaging a recess 52 in the clip, it does not engage an aperture in the bridge portion 56. With regard to claims 19,24, the prior art fails to provide "biasing" an engagement detent through an aperture in the retainer.

Accordingly, claims 9,10,15,16,18,19,21,22,24 are allowable over the prior art of record.

### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8,11-14,17,18,20,23,25-27 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

It is noted that upon further review of the claims, several problems under 35 USC 112 were discovered and are now presented in paragraph 1 above. In response to Applicant's arguments, the aforementioned claims are rejected in view of the previously cited art to Martin, Mall and Dauenbaugh or Myers.

Applicant's arguments against the Mall patent, on page 4 of the response, are not persuasive since the Mall patent is used merely to teach the added security of the

prongs 60 which are concerned with securing the lock body. Furthermore, it is noted that the Mall patent is classified in class 285 and 411 which are coupling and fastening devices and not the field of hand tools as Applicant argues. It is true that one of ordinary skill in the art might not look to the field of hand tools, but one would clearly look to the fastening arts to find a retainer clip. Further, Applicant's arguments on page 5-6 regarding the non-perpendicular engagement of the retainer with the groove also is not persuasive and are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection under 35 USC 112 set forth in paragragh 1. Accordingly, claims 1-8,11-14,17,18,20,23,25-27 stand rejected.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne Dino Barrett whose telephone number is 703-308-0825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Will can be reached on 703-308-3870. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Suzanne Dino Barrett Primary Examiner Art Unit 3676

sdb